Case 2:25-cv-00554-TLN-CKD Documer	nt 14	Filed 07/16/25	Page 1 of 2
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
FERNANDO MAZON,	No	. 2:25-cv-0554 TL	N CKD P
Plaintiff,			
v.	OF	RDER	
RADU, et al.,			
Defendants.			
This matter is before the Court on pro se Plaintiff Fernando Mazon's ("Plaintiff") motion			
for an extension of time to file objections. (ECF No. 12.) For the reasons set forth below, the			
9 Court GRANTS Plaintiff's motion.			
On May 13, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations to			
dismiss this action without prejudice because Plaintiff had not filed an amended complaint as			
directed. (ECF No. 9.) Plaintiff was given fourteen days after being served with these findings			
and recommendations to object. ( <i>Id.</i> ) On June 18, because no objections had been received, this			
Court adopted the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 10.) Judgment was entered that			
same day. (ECF No. 11.)			
On June 30, 2025, Plaintiff filed the instant motion seeking an opportunity to file			
objections. (ECF No. 12.) Plaintiff states the magistrate judge's May 13, 2025, order was not			
placed in his hands until June 12, 2025. ( <i>Id.</i> ) Plaintiff argues his failure to file objections were			
	UNITED STATE FOR THE EASTERN I  FERNANDO MAZON, Plaintiff, V. RADU, et al., Defendants.  This matter is before the Court on pro for an extension of time to file objections. (E Court GRANTS Plaintiff's motion. On May 13, 2025, the assigned magist dismiss this action without prejudice because directed. (ECF No. 9.) Plaintiff was given for and recommendations to object. (Id.) On Jun Court adopted the findings and recommendati same day. (ECF No. 11.) On June 30, 2025, Plaintiff filed the in objections. (ECF No. 12.) Plaintiff states the	UNITED STATES DIS' FOR THE EASTERN DISTRI  FERNANDO MAZON, Plaintiff, v. RADU, et al., Defendants.  This matter is before the Court on pro se Plain for an extension of time to file objections. (ECF No. Court GRANTS Plaintiff's motion. On May 13, 2025, the assigned magistrate juddismiss this action without prejudice because Plaintiff directed. (ECF No. 9.) Plaintiff was given fourteen and recommendations to object. (Id.) On June 18, be Court adopted the findings and recommendations. (E same day. (ECF No. 11.) On June 30, 2025, Plaintiff filed the instant mobjections. (ECF No. 12.) Plaintiff states the magist	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFOR  FERNANDO MAZON, Plaintiff, v. ORDER  RADU, et al., Defendants.  This matter is before the Court on pro se Plaintiff Fernando Maz for an extension of time to file objections. (ECF No. 12.) For the reaso Court GRANTS Plaintiff's motion. On May 13, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings dismiss this action without prejudice because Plaintiff had not filed an a directed. (ECF No. 9.) Plaintiff was given fourteen days after being set and recommendations to object. (Id.) On June 18, because no objection Court adopted the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 10.) Judg same day. (ECF No. 11.) On June 30, 2025, Plaintiff filed the instant motion seeking an objections. (ECF No. 12.) Plaintiff states the magistrate judge's May 1

## for reasons beyond his control and requests the Court to allow him to file his objections. Plaintiff further states a desire to proceed with this action. (*Id.* at 1–2.) Under these circumstances, the Court finds it appropriate to set aside the judgment and allow Plaintiff an extension to file his objections to the findings and recommendations. See, e.g., Allen v. Delacruz, No. 1:22-CV-00633-JLT-HBK, 2022 WL 21816840, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2022) (similarly setting aside judgment where due to circumstances outside his control, Plaintiff was unable to file timely objections). Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The Court's prior order (ECF No. 10), and the judgment entered in this action on June 18, 2025, (ECF No. 11) are VACATED. 2. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to file objections to the magistrate judge's May 13, 2025, findings and recommendations, (ECF No. 12), is GRANTED. 3. Plaintiff's objections must be filed within 30 days after being served with this order. Date: July 15, 2025 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Document 14

Filed 07/16/25

Page 2 of 2

Case 2:25-cv-00554-TLN-CKD